IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Applicant	: Howard T. Marano
Serial No.	: 10/007,370
Filed	: February 19, 2002
For	: Method, Apparatus, System And User Interface For Scheduling Tasks
Examiner	: Beth Van Doren
Art Unit	: 3623

APPEAL BRIEF

May It Please The Honorable Board:

Appellants appeal the Office Action dated December 19, 2006 of Claims 1-19 of the above-identified application. The fee of five hundred dollars ($500.00) for filing this Brief and any associated extension fee is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2179. Enclosed is a single copy of this Brief.

Please charge any additional fee or credit any overpayment to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Appellants do not request an oral hearing.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest of Application Serial No. 10/007,370 is the Assignee of record:

Siemens Medical Solutions Health Services Corporation
51 Valley Stream Parkway
Malvern, PA 19355-1406

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are currently, and have been, no related Appeals or Interferences regarding Application Serial No. 10/007,370.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-19 are rejected and the rejection of claims 1-19 is appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All amendments were entered and are reflected in the claims included in Appendix I.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 provides a method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules (page 2, lines 3-5). Display is initiated of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks (page 10, lines 9-12; Figure 2, 100). An identifier representing

a selected task is assigned to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event (page 2, lines 21-23; Figure 6, 532). The particular task schedule is associated with a particular entity of the corresponding plurality of different entities (page 2, lines 19-20; Figure 5, 220, 224). Decision information entered via the at least one interface menu is received (page 2, lines 9-10; Figure 6, 520). The received decision information is applied and the execution of the at least one executable procedure is initiated, in response to the received information identifying an event (page 2, lines 21-23; Figure 6, 532). A task is automatically selected from a plurality of different tasks (page 1, lines 9-12; Figure 6, 550). A task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by the particular entity is assigned to the task schedule associated with the particular entity (page 2, lines 19-20; Figure 6, 532).

Dependent claim 2 includes the method of independent claim 1 along with the activity of initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to automatically select the particular task schedule from the plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to the received information identifying an event (page 10, line 22-25; Figure 6, 550). The step of initiating display of the at least one interface menu includes initiating display of menu elements prompting a user to identify at least one of (a) the predetermined event triggering application of the decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule, (b) a source of the decision information, (c) decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for identifying a

task schedule for listing the task representative identifier (page 11, lines 18-22; Figure 6, 524).

Dependent claim 3 includes the same method as claim 1 along with the additional feature that the decision information initiates execution of at least one logical procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier (page 8, lines 17-20; Figure 6, 522).

Dependent claim 5 includes the same method as claim 1 along with the additional feature that the decision information initiates execution of the at least one executable procedure to automatically and programmatically without user intervention select the task and assign the identifier, in response to received information identifying an event (page 2, line 21-23; Figure 6, 530, 532). The entity comprises at least one of (a) a category of users, (b) one or more users currently designated to perform a healthcare worker role and (c) a medical device or system (page 3, lines 15-17).

Dependent claim 6 includes the method of claim 1 along with the feature that the decision information identifies the predetermined event (page 2, lines 21-23). The predetermined event corresponds to at least one of (a) patient admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure and (d) a user defined event based on information acquired (page 13, lines 7-9; Figure 6, 550).

Dependent claim 7 includes the method of claim 1 along with the feature that the

received decision information initiates execution of the at least one executable procedure to prioritize a plurality of task representative identifiers of a task schedule associated with a particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event (page 13, lines 10-12; Figure 6, 555).

Independent claim 8 provides a method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules (page 2, lines 3-5). Display is initiated of at least one interface menu which supports user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a selected task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities (page 10, lines 9-12; Figure 2, 100). The selected task schedule is associated with a particular entity of the corresponding plurality of different entities and accessible by the particular entity (page 2, lines 19-20; Figure 5, 220, 224). The decision information includes data identifying: i. at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to select a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule (page 2, lines 18-20; Figure 6, 532), and ii. an event for triggering application of the at least one executable procedure (page 4, line 10). Decision information entered via the at least one interface menu is received (page 2, lines 9-10; Figure 6, 520). Execution of the at least one executable procedure is automatically initiated to select the selected task schedule from the plurality of displayable task schedules and assign the task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the particular entity, to the selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event

(page 10, lines 10-16; Figure 2, 100; Figure 6, 530, 532, 540, 550).

Dependent claim 12 includes the method of claim 8 along with the additional feature that the at least one executable procedure conditions allocation of the task to the task schedule associated with the particular entity upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences (page 11, lines 12-16). Data is acquired to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences (page 11, lines 13-16; Figure 6, 524, 526).

Dependent claim 13 includes the method of claim 8 along with the additional feature that the triggering event is conditioned upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences (page 11, lines 12-13). Data is acquired to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences (page 11, lines 13-16; Figure 6, 524, 526).

Dependent claim 14 includes the method of claim 8 along with the additional feature that the at least one executable procedure removes a task representative identifier from the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event (page 13, lines 12-14; Figure 6, 557).

Independent claim 15 provides a method for providing a user interface for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules (page 2, lines 3-5). In response to a user command, the display is initiated of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a

plurality of different tasks (page 10, lines 9-12; Figure 6, 532). An identifier representing a selected task is assigned to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event (page 12, lines 22-24; Figure 6, 532). The particular task schedule is associated with a particular entity of the corresponding plurality of different entities (page 2, lines 19-20; Figure 5, 220, 224). Display of an updated task schedule including the selected task having the assigned identifier associated with the particular entity is initiated, in response to received information identifying an event (page 10, lines 13-16; Figure 2, 100; Figure 6, 530, 532, 540, 550).

Independent claim 16 provides a method for providing a user interface supporting assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules (page 2, lines 3-5). In response to a user command, display is initiated of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks (page 10, lines 9-12; Figure 6, 532). An identifier representing a selected task is assigned to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event (page 10, lines 19-21; Figure 6, 532). The particular task schedule is accessible by the particular entity (page 2, lines 19-20; Figure 5, 220, 224). The decision information includes data identifying at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier (page 2, lines 18-20; Figure 6, 532). The task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the particular entity

is assigned to the particular task schedule (page 12, lines 15-17; Figure 1, 30; Figure 6, 532). An event triggers application of the at least one executable procedure (page 4, line 10). Display of an updated task schedule associated with a particular entity is initiated (page 10, lines 13-16; Figure 2, 100; Figure 6, 530, 532, 540, 550). The updated task schedule is generated in response to received information identifying a triggering event initiating execution of the at least one executable procedure to automatically assign the task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the particular entity, to the task schedule associated with the particular entity (Page 10, lines 13-16; Figure 6, 530, 532, 540, 550).

Independent claim 17 provides a method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules (page 2, lines 3-5). Display is initiated of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for selectively assigning a task representative identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities (page 12, lines 22-24; Figure 6, 532). The at least one of the plurality of displayable tasks schedules is associated with a respective one of the corresponding plurality of different entities (page 2, lines 19-20; Figure 5, 220, 224). The decision information includes data identifying at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning the task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the particular entity, to the particular task schedule (page 2, lines 18-20; Figure 6, 532). An event triggers application of the at least one executable procedure (page 4, line 10). Decision

information entered via the at least one interface menu is received (page 2, lines 9-10; Figure 6, 520). Execution of the at least one executable procedure is automatically initiated to select a particular task schedule from the plurality of displayable task schedules (page 10, lines 10-16; Figure 6, 520, 522, 550). The task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the respective one of the corresponding plurality of different entities is automatically selectively assigned to the at least one of the plurality of task schedules associated with the corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to occurrence of the triggering event (page 12, lines 22-24; Figure 6, 532).

Independent claim 18 provides a system for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules (page 2, lines 3-5). A display processor initiates display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks (page 10, lines 9-12; Figure 6, 532). An identifier representing a selected task is assigned to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event (page 2, lines 21-23; Figure 6, 532). The particular task schedule is associated with a particular entity of the corresponding plurality of different entities (page 2, lines 19-20; Figure 5, 220, 224). An interface processor receives decision information entered via the at least one interface menu and automatically initiates execution of the at least one executable procedure, in response to received information identifying occurrence of an event (page

2, lines 9-10, 21-23; Figure 6, 532). A task is automatically selected from a plurality of different tasks (page 10, lines 9-12; Figure 6, 550) A task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by the particular entity is automatically assigned to the task schedule associated with the particular entity (page 2, lines 19-20; Figure 6, 532).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-11 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Srimuang (U.S. 2003/0061087).

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srimuang (U.S. 2003/0061087) in view of Mayhak, Jr., et al. (U.S. 2001/0051888).

VII. ARGUMENT

Srimuang, when taken alone or in any combination with Mayhak, Jr. does not make the present claimed invention unpatentable. Thus, reversal of the Final Rejection (hereinafter termed "rejection") of claims 1-11 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and claims 12-13 under section 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) is respectfully requested.

Overview of the Cited References

Srimuang describes calendaring and scheduling software wherein separate groups are separately administered, especially with respect to access rules and the related ability to self-reserve appointments. Also, scheduling rules, schedule conflict rules and resource scheduling for use in vendor/customer scheduling and customer self-reservation of vendor appointments is provided. (See Abstract)

Mayhak, Jr. describes a system and method for managing a health clinic, and in particular to managing/scheduling employees to work in the clinic. The system and method relates to a computer program for computing the needs of patients, determining adequate staffing requirements and displays these needs and requirements in connection with actual scheduling values. Thus, the system provides a tool for quickly determining whether the clinic is overstaffed or understaffed, for the entire day based on patient needs, both direct and indirect patient care needs. The system and method may further use facility limitation information to provide overall efficiency information. (See Abstract)

Rejection of Claims 1-11 and 14-19 under 35 USC 102(e) over Srimuang (U.S. 2003/0061087)

Srimuang does not anticipate claims 1-11 and 14-19. Thus, reversal of the Final Rejection (hereinafter termed "rejection") of claims 1-11 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 19

The present claimed invention provides a method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable tasks schedules. Display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task for a plurality of different tasks is initiated. An identifier representing a selected task is assigned to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displaying task schedules associated with a corresponding

plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event. The particular task schedule is associated with a particular entity of the corresponding plurality of different entities. The decision information entered via the at least one interface menu is received. The received decision information is applied and the execution of the at least one executable procedure is initiated, in response to received information identifying an event to automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks. A task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed is assigned by the particular entity, to the task schedule associated with the particular entity.

The method of claim 1 initiates display of an "interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities in response to received information identifying an event." The method advantageously enables user customizable, automatic, event driven, healthcare worker (and medical device) task scheduling. For example, assume, "Dr. Jones is the Radiologist who protocols all spiral CT exams. When a spinal CT is ordered, that exam will be added to Dr. Jones' protocol work list 1, and at the same time, can be added to a CT technologist work list 1 of exams to be performed on the day for which it was ordered. When Dr. Jones protocols the exam, it would be removed from his work list 1. When the exam is tracked to the Begin Procedure step, it can be removed from the technologist work list 1"

(Specification, page 12, lines 10-15). This **automatic** task selection and assignment significantly improves hospital personnel and resource allocation, planning and operation and is not suggested by the user driven manual scheduling or appointment systems of the cited references. Such scheduling or appointment systems merely schedule tasks or appointments that are selected **by a user** and in contrast to the claimed method, do NOT automatically select tasks from multiple available tasks or select a worker from multiple workers and assign tasks to the selected worker.

Srimuang, unlike the present claimed invention, provides calendaring and scheduling software wherein separate groups are separately administered, especially with respect to access rules and the related ability to self-reserve appointments (See Abstract). Srimuang deals with the extra time and effort involved with multiple calendars being consulted and maintained separately by grouping parties into groups for the purposes of view access and/or revision access to a computer-based calendar (see Srimuang paragraph [0008] and paragraph [0009]).

Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure ... in response to received information identifying an event ... to automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Although Srimuang describes a scheduling system, the scheduling is performed by **a user** and not automatically as in the claimed arrangement. Fig. 8 of Srimuang "shows a screen used by the manager of vendor A to add an appointment ... the manager has previously set his level of revision access ... and has allowed himself free reign to **make appointments on this calendar**. This is why screen display 240, presented to the manager in making the appointment, limits date to Monday through Friday, and limits times from 9 am to 9 pm. The manager's level of revision access is well-tailored to the employment relationship that he has with employee A" (paragraph [0097]). Or, alternatively, "there are different ways of confirming new appointments or events. FIGS. 8 and 9, show self-reservation situations, wherein the appointment requires no confirmation, but rather is unilaterally made (with prescribed limits) **by the requestor**. However, sometimes it is more appropriate to have the requestor merely request an appointment (e.g., by email), which then must be conformed by the schedule" (paragraph [0099]). Thus, all appointments in Srimuang are manually scheduled by a requestor. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which "automatically select[s] a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign[s] a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity." Thus, unlike Srimuang, the claimed method enables automatic selection and assignment of an identifier for the task that was automatically assigned.

Srimuang, in paragraph 0080 and 0081 (and elsewhere), cited in the Office Action, merely describes a method and system for different groups making use of the

same calendar/scheduler belonging to a member of all of the groups. The oil change described in paragraph 0080 is not an automatically scheduled task, as described in the present claimed invention, but rather a manually driven resource scheduler. The customer selects the task they want done, i.e. an oil change, and the system schedules the people and resources necessary to perform the task/oil change. Nowhere in these passages, or elsewhere in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** selection of a task from a plurality of tasks, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there "received information identifying an event" that results in "automatically select(ing) a task from a plurality of different tasks" and applies decision information to schedule "a selected task to be performed by said particular entity." This **automatic** task selection (and assignment) significantly improves hospital personnel and resource allocation, planning and operation and is not suggested by the user driven manual scheduling or appointment systems of the cited reference. Such scheduling or appointment systems merely schedule tasks or appointments that are selected **by a user** and in contrast to the claimed method, do NOT automatically select tasks from multiple available tasks or select a worker from multiple workers and assign tasks to the selected worker.

Furthermore, the Office Action cites paragraph 0013 of Srimuang as being relevant to the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Srimuang, in the cited passage, merely describes that "while the customer may schedule a signal service appointment to occur during some desired time interval, the scheduling program

may specifically schedule the various people and resources for only the portions of the service time interval where they will be needed ... In this case, the calendars for the nurse, the doctor, the x-ray room and the exam room can be scheduled only for the respective periods that they are actually required" (paragraph [0013]). Srimuang merely describes a single calendar with multiple sets of access and revision rules set for different predefined groups of users. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which "automatically select[s] a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign[s] a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity." Furthermore, in Srimuang, a **user** manually selects the service appointment as the task and the scheduler schedules the resources to perform the task (i.e. nurses for a medical exam). Nowhere in this passage or anywhere else in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** selection of a **task** from a plurality of tasks, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages (or elsewhere in Srimurang) is there any suggestion of "received information identifying an event" that results in "automatically select(ing) a task from a plurality of different tasks" and applies decision information to schedule "a selected task to be performed by said particular entity" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

The Office Action argues that Fig. 13-15, 2, 6 and paragraphs 0013, 0056, 0068-0069, 0080-0081, 0087, 0109-0110 of Srimuang describes "an interface [which] allows users to enter information identifying an event (i.e. service event). Once this is entered, the system identifies multiple tasks associated with the service, the tasks associated with

employees and/or resources. The system automatically checks the availability of these schedules and places a selected task on the schedule of selected entity (employee or resource)." However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion in the Office Action. There is no mention or suggestion of "automatically select[ing] a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign[ing] a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed" by a particular entity, to the "task schedule associated with said particular entity" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. In Srimuang, a user selects an available time slot to schedule an appointment. A manager or the system may check the availability of the appointment which is made **by a user**. However, merely scheduling an appointment as in Srimuang is not equivalent to the automatic selection of **tasks** from multiple available tasks **in response to received information identifying an event** as in the present claimed invention. An **appointment** to receive a service is NOT equivalent to (and does not suggest) selection of a **task** for performance. Furthermore, the Office Action erroneously asserts that Srimuang automatically checks the **availability** of schedules. Srimuang may list available time slots for an appointment after checking the availability, however, Srimuang is still not equivalent to the present claimed invention because a list of available time slots for assignment of a manually input task is NOT "automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign[s] a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Similarly, paragraphs 0056, 0068-0069, and 0109-0110 of Srimuang, cited in the Office Action, fail to describe the features of the present claimed invention. Rather, paragraph 0056 merely describes that a schedulee is an entity associated with a schedule and paragraphs 0068-0069 merely describe an exemplary scheduling and calendaring computer system including internet, scheduling server computer system, vendor A intranet, vendor B intranet, customer A computer, customer B computer and customer C computer. Paragraphs 0109-0110 describe a single request, such as for a medical exam, that may be used to schedule a combination of people and resources, such as a doctor, nurse, examination room and tongue depressors. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no mention in the cited (or non-cited) paragraphs in Srimuang, that provides any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** selection of a **task** from a plurality of tasks, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there "received information identifying an event" that results in "automatically select(ing) a task from a plurality of different tasks" and applies decision information to schedule "a selected task to be performed by said particular entity" and "initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure" in performing the selected task as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Furthermore, Fig. 2 and Fig. 6 of Srimuang, cited by the Office Action, merely display available and non-available time slots for a certain employee of a vendor. "FIG. 2 is a screen display 180 of employee A's calendar as it would appear to employee A ... details of all appointments are shown, and it makes sense that employee A has full view access of his own calendar and its events" (paragraph [0083]). "FIG. 6 shows screen

display 220, which is a view of employee A's calendar granted to a vendor A customer. The customer can only see the portion of the calendar corresponding to employee A's working hours, and even during these hours the customer can only see whether employee A is available for further appointments, or whether employee A is booked. This limited view access respects employee A's privacy, while allowing the customer a reasonable amount of information to use in deciding when to request an oil change or a tire change appointment" (paragraph [0095]). Again, the disclosure in the cited sections of Srimuang merely provides for manual selection of an appointment by a user which is fundamentally different from the automatic selection of a **task** and initiation of execution of an executable procedure of the present claimed invention. Similarly, Fig. 14 and 15 cited in the Office Action, also allow a user to schedule an appointment at a salon at available time slots. Thus, these figures merely allow a user to find an available time slot, and book an appointment during the selected slot. However, as argued in the above, merely booking an available time slot as in Srimuang is wholly unlike the automatic task selection and task representative identifier assignment as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "automatically select[ing] a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign[ing] a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 19 are dependent on claim 1 and are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 19 under USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 2

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to automatically select said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to said received information identifying an event and wherein the step of initiating display of the at least one interface menu includes initiating display of menu elements prompting a user to identify at least one of (a) the predetermined event triggering application of the decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule, (b) a source of the decision information, (c) decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for identifying a task schedule for listing the task representative identifier" as recited in the present claimed invention. As described above, Srimuang is a manually driven system. Srimuang merely allows a user to **manually** select an available time slot when booking an appointment, such as a hair appointment or an oil change appointment. The passages cited in the Office Action for claim 2 are the same passages cited with regard to claim 1. Nowhere in these passages or elsewhere in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to **automatically** select said particular task schedule from said plurality of

displayable task schedules, in response to said received information identifying an event" as recited in claim 2 of the present invention. Srimuang merely allows for manual selection of individual time slots for a task and is not at all concerned with automatic selection of particular **task schedules from said plurality of displayable task schedules**. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 5

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above in connection with claim 1. Claim 5 is also considered to be patentable because Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "said decision information initiates execution of said at least one executable procedure to automatically and programmatically without user intervention select said task and assign said identifier, in response to received information identifying an event and the entity comprises at least one of (a) a category of users, (b) one or more users currently designated to perform a healthcare worker role and (c) a medical device or system" as recited in the present claimed invention. As described above with respect to claim 1, Srimuang is merely a manually driven resource scheduler. As such, Srimuang fails to provide any suggestion of the combination of features of claims 1 and 5. Specifically, Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "at least one executable procedure to **automatically and programmatically without user intervention** select said task and assign said identifier" as recited in the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that, contrary to the present invention, Srimuang is inoperable without user intervention as it is the user in Srimuang that selects the task to be performed, such as a medical exam, salon booking or oil

change. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 8-11

Claim 8 provides a method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules. Display of at least one interface menu which supports user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a selected task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities is initiated. The selected task schedule is associated with a particular entity of the corresponding plurality of different entities and accessible by the particular entity. The decision information includes data identifying at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to select a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, and an event for triggering application of the at least one executable procedure. Decision information entered via the at least one interface menu is received and execution of the at least one executable procedure is automatically initiated to select the selected task schedule from the plurality of displayable task schedules and assign the task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the particular entity, to the selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event.

Srimuang provides calendaring and scheduling software wherein separate groups

are separately administered, especially with respect to access rules and the related ability to self-reserve appointments (See Abstract). Srimuang deals with the extra time and effort involved with multiple calendars being consulted and maintained separately by grouping parties into groups for the purposes of view access and/or revision access to a computer-based calendar (see Srimuang paragraph [0008] and paragraph [0009]).

Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "initiating execution of at least one interface menu ... receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu ... automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity" as recited in claim 8 of the present invention.

Although Srimuang describes a scheduling system, the scheduling is performed manually by **a user**. Fig. 8 of Srimuang "shows a screen used by the manager of vendor A to add an appointment ... the manager has previously set his level of revision access ... and has allowed himself free reign to **make appointments on this calendar**. This is why screen display 240, presented to the manager in making the appointment, limits date to Monday through Friday, and limits times from 9 am to 9 pm. The manager's level of revision access is well-tailored to the employment relationship that he has with employee A" (paragraph [0097]). Or, alternatively, "there are different ways of confirming new appointments or events. FIGS. 8 and 9, show self-reservation situations, wherein the appointment requires no confirmation, but rather is unilaterally made (with prescribed

limits) **by the requestor**. However, sometimes it is more appropriate to have the requestor merely request an appointment (e.g., by email), which then must be conformed by the schedule" (paragraph [0099]). Thus, all appointments in Srimuang are manually scheduled by a requestor. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which recites "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event."

The Office Action cites paragraph 0013 of Srimuang as being relevant to the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Srimuang merely describes that "while the customer may schedule a signal service appointment to occur during some desired time interval, the scheduling program may specifically schedule the various people and resources for only the portions of the service time interval where they will be needed ... In this case, the calendars for the nurse, the doctor, the x-ray room and the exam room can be scheduled only for the respective periods that they are actually required" (paragraph [0013]). Srimuang merely describes a single calendar with multiple sets of access and revision rules set for different predefined groups of users. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which recites "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected

task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event." Furthermore, in Srimuang, again a user selects the service appointment as the task and the scheduler schedules the resources to perform the medical exam. Nowhere in this passage or anywhere else in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure that describes **automatically** initiating execution of an executable procedure to select the selected task schedule from a plurality of displayable task schedules, as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests the features presented in claim 8 of the present invention.

Srimuang, in paragraph 0080 and 0081, cited in the Office Action, and elsewhere, merely describes a method and system for different groups making use of the same calendar/scheduler belonging to a member of all of the groups. The oil change described in paragraph 0080 is a manually driven resource scheduler. The customer selects the task they want done, i.e. an oil change, and the system schedules the people and resources necessary to perform the task/oil change. Nowhere in these passages, or elsewhere in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** execution of an executable procedure to select a selected task schedule, as in the present claimed invention.

The Office Action on page 6 argues that Fig. 13-15 and paragraphs 0013, 0056, 0068-0069, 0080-0081, 0087, 0109-0110 of Srimuang describes "an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure ... wherein input of the service request triggers the automatic search for availability". However, Applicant respectfully

submits that Srimuang describes a scheduling or appointment system that merely schedules tasks or appointments selected **by a user**. When a user wishes to schedule an appointment, the user must find available allotted time slots. A manager or the system may check the availability of the appointment which is made **by the user**. However, merely scheduling an appointment as in Srimuang is not equivalent to the automatic initiation execution to select a **task** schedule from multiple task schedules, as in the present claimed invention. An **appointment** to receive a service is NOT equivalent to (and does not suggest) selection of a **task** for performance. Moreover, there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in the cited passages of Srimuang of the claimed "decision information". Specifically, Srimuang fails to disclose the claimed "executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to select a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier…to said selected task schedule" and "an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure." In Srimuang, there is no automatic checking of schedules, rather, any availability confirmation is performed manually by a manager. Additionally, manually choosing a task and scheduling the task by the user is not equivalent to the claimed triggering event which automatically initiates the claimed executable procedure used to automatically select a task schedule. Srimuang merely enables manual selection and scheduling of an appointment. These are fundamentally different action and are not equivalent to one another.

Similarly, paragraphs 0056, 0068-0069, and 0109-0110 of Srimuang, cited in the Office Action, fails to describe the features of the present claimed invention. Rather,

paragraph 0056 merely describes that a schedulee is an entity associated with a schedule. However, this is not a task representative identifier as in the present claimed invention. Additionally, paragraphs 0109-0110 describe a single request, such as for a medical exam may be used to schedule a combination of people and resources, such as a doctor, nurse, examination room and tongue depressors. Applicant respectfully submits that not a single paragraph in Srimuang, including those cited in the Office Action as well as the non-cited paragraphs, provide any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** initiating execution to select a selected task schedule, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there "received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event" that results in "automatically initiating execution ... to select said selected task schedule from a plurality of displayable task schedules and assign ... a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule" as recited in claim 8 of the present invention.

Furthermore, Fig. 2 of Srimuang, cited by the Office Action, merely displays available and non-available time slots for a certain employee of a vendor. "FIG. 2 is a screen display 180 of employee A's calendar as it would appear to employee A ... details of all appointments are shown, and it makes sense that employee A has full view access of his own calendar and its events" (paragraph [0083]). Similarly, Fig. 14 and 15 cited in the Office Action, allow a user to schedule an appointment at a salon at available time slots. Thus, these figures merely allow a user to find an available time slot, and book an appointment during the selected slot. However, as argued in the above, merely booking an available time slot as in Srimuang is wholly unlike the automatic execution of the

executable procedure to select a selected **task** schedule as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "automatically initiating execution ... to select said selected task schedule from a plurality of displayable task schedules and assign ... a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule" as recited in claim 8 of the present invention. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 are dependent on claim 8 and are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above in connection with claim 8. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-11 under USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 14

Claim 14 is dependent on claim 8 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above in connection with claim 8. Claim 14 is also considered to be patentable because Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "wherein said at least one executable procedure removes a task representative identifier from the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event" as recited in the present claimed invention. Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, paragraphs 31, 45, 65, 80-81 and 108 merely describe detection of a schedule conflict with a preferred employee and scheduling the service with an alternate employee. Applicant respectfully submits that scheduling a service with a second-choice resource because the first-choice resource presents a conflict is not equivalent to "said at least one executable procedure removes a task representative identifier from the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event" as

recited in the present claimed invention. The relied on sections fail to make any suggestion of "applying the received **decision information** in **removing** a task representative identifier from the **task schedule** associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of **a triggering event**." Removal of task identifiers is not discussed or mentioned anywhere in the cited reference. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 15

Claim 15 provides a method for providing a user interface for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules. In response to a user command, the display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks is initiated. An identifier representing a selected task is assigned to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event. The particular task schedule is associated with a particular entity of the corresponding plurality of different entities. Display of an updated task schedule including the selected task having the assigned identifier associated with the particular entity is initiated, in response to received information identifying an event.

Srimuang provides calendaring and scheduling software wherein separate groups are separately administered, especially with respect to access rules and the related ability

to self-reserve appointments (See Abstract). Srimuang deals with the extra time and effort involved with multiple calendars being consulted and maintained separately by grouping parties into groups for the purposes of view access and/or revision access to a computer-based calendar (see Srimuang paragraph [0008] and paragraph [0009]).

Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "initiating display of at least one interface menu ... for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 15 of the present invention.

Although Srimuang describes a scheduling system, the scheduling is performed by **a user**. Fig. 8 of Srimuang "shows a screen used by the manager of vendor A to add an appointment ... the manager has previously set his level of revision access ... and has allowed himself free reign to **make appointments on this calendar**. This is why screen display 240, presented to the manager in making the appointment, limits date to Monday through Friday, and limits times from 9 am to 9 pm. The manager's level of revision access is well-tailored to the employment relationship that he has with employee A" (paragraph [0097]). Or, alternatively, "there are different ways of confirming new appointments or events. FIGS. 8 and 9, show self-reservation situations, wherein the appointment requires no confirmation, but rather is unilaterally made (with prescribed limits) **by the requestor**. However, sometimes it is more appropriate to have the requestor merely request an appointment (e.g., by email), which then must be conformed

by the schedule" (paragraph [0099]). Thus, all appointments in Srimuang are manually scheduled by a requestor. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which "automatically and programmatically ... [selects] a task from a plurality of different tasks and ... [assigns] an identifier representing a selected task associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities."

Srimuang, in paragraph 0080 and 0081, cited in the Office Action, and elsewhere, merely describes a method and system for different groups making use of the same calendar/scheduler belonging to a member of all of the groups. The oil change described in paragraph 0080 is not an automatically scheduled task, as described in the present claimed invention, but rather a manually driven resource scheduler. The customer selects the task they want done, i.e. an oil change, and the system schedules the people and resources necessary to perform the task/oil change. Nowhere in these passages, or elsewhere in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** selection of a **task** from a plurality of tasks, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there mention or suggestion of "automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks" as recited in claim 15 of the present invention. This **automatic** task selection significantly improves hospital personnel and resource allocation, planning and operation and is not suggested by the user driven manual scheduling or appointment systems of the cited reference. Such scheduling or appointment systems merely schedule tasks or appointments that are selected **by a user** and in contrast to the claimed method, do NOT automatically select tasks from multiple

available tasks or select a worker from multiple workers and assign tasks to the selected worker.

Furthermore, the Office Action cites paragraph 0013 of Srimuang as being relevant to the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Srimuang merely describes that "while the customer may schedule a signal service appointment to occur during some desired time interval, the scheduling program may specifically schedule the various people and resources for only the portions of the service time interval where they will be needed ... In this case, the calendars for the nurse, the doctor, the x-ray room and the exam room can be scheduled only for the respective periods that they are actually required" (paragraph [0013]). Srimuang merely describes a single calendar with multiple sets of access and revision rules set for different predefined groups of users. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which recites "automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities." Furthermore, in Srimuang, again a user selects the service appointment as the task and the scheduler schedules the resources to perform the medical exam. Nowhere in this passage or anywhere else in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** selection of a **task** from a plurality of tasks, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there "received information identifying an event" that results in "automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks

and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 15 of the present invention.

The Office Action on page 7 argues that Fig. 13-15, 2, 6 and paragraphs 0013, 0056, 0068-0069, 0080-0081, 0087, 0109-0110 of Srimuang describes "an interface [which] allows users to enter information identifying an event (i.e. service event). Once this is entered, the system identifies multiple tasks associated with the service, the tasks associated with employees and/or resources. The system automatically checks the availability of these schedules and places a selected task on the schedule of selected entity (employee or resource)." However, Applicant respectfully submits that in Srimuang, there is no mention or suggestion of "automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 15 of the present invention. In Srimuang, a user selects an available time slot to schedule an appointment. A manager or the system may check the availability of the appointment which is made **by a user**. However, merely scheduling an appointment as in Srimuang is not equivalent to the automatic selection of tasks from multiple available tasks as in the present claimed invention. An **appointment** to receive a service is NOT equivalent to (and does not suggest) selection of a **task** for performance. Furthermore, the Office Action states that Srimuang automatically checks the **availability** of schedules. Srimuang may list available time slots for an appointment after checking the availability,

however, Srimuang is still not equivalent to the present claimed invention which "automatically and programmatically ... [selects] a task from a plurality of different tasks and ... [assigns] an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 15 of the present invention.

Similarly, paragraphs 0056, 0068-0069, and 0109-0110 of Srimuang, cited in the Office Action, fail to describe the features of the present claimed invention. Rather, paragraph 0056 merely describes that a schedulee is an entity associated with a schedule. Paragraphs 0068-0069 merely describe an exemplary scheduling and calendaring computer system including internet, scheduling server computer system, vendor A intranet, vendor B intranet, customer A computer, customer B computer and customer C computer. Paragraphs 0109-0110 describe a single request, such as for a medical exam may be used to schedule a combination of people and resources, such as a doctor, nurse, examination room and tongue depressors. Applicant respectfully submits that not a single paragraph in Srimuang, including those cited in the Office Action as well as the non-cited paragraphs, provide any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** selection of a **task** from a plurality of tasks, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there "received information identifying an event" that results in "automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of

displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 15 of the present invention.

Furthermore, Fig. 2 and Fig. 6 of Srimuang, cited by the Office Action, merely display available and non-available time slots for a certain employee of a vendor. "FIG. 2 is a screen display 180 of employee A's calendar as it would appear to employee A ... details of all appointments are shown, and it makes sense that employee A has full view access of his own calendar and its events" (paragraph [0083]). "FIG. 6 shows screen display 220, which is a view of employee A's calendar granted to a vendor A customer. The customer can only see the portion of the calendar corresponding to employee A's working hours, and even during these hours the customer can only see whether employee A is available for further appointments, or whether employee A is booked. This limited view access respects employee A's privacy, while allowing the customer a reasonable amount of information to use in deciding when to request an oil change or a tire change appointment" (paragraph [0095]). Similarly, Fig. 14 and 15 cited in the Office Action, allow a user to schedule an appointment at a salon at available time slots. Thus, these figures merely allow a user to find an available time slot, and book an appointment during the selected slot. However, as argued in the above, merely booking an available time slot as in Srimuang is wholly unlike the automatic task selection as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities"

as recited in claim 15 of the present invention. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 16

Claim 16 provides a method for providing a user interface supporting assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules. In response to a user command, display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks is initiated. An identifier representing a selected task is assigned to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event. The particular task schedule is accessible by the particular entity. The decision information includes data identifying at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative. The task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the particular entity is assigned to the particular task schedule. An event triggers application of the at least one executable procedure. Display of an updated task schedule associated with a particular entity is initiated. The updated task schedule is generated in response to received information identifying a triggering event initiating execution of the at least one executable procedure to automatically assign the task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the particular entity, to the task schedule associated with the particular entity.

Srimuang provides calendaring and scheduling software wherein separate groups

are separately administered, especially with respect to access rules and the related ability to self-reserve appointments (See Abstract). Srimuang deals with the extra time and effort involved with multiple calendars being consulted and maintained separately by grouping parties into groups for the purposes of view access and/or revision access to a computer-based calendar (see Srimuang paragraph [0008] and paragraph [0009]).

Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "initiating display of at least one interface menu ... for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displaying task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 16 of the present invention.

Although Srimuang describes a scheduling system, the scheduling is performed by **a user**. Fig. 8 of Srimuang "shows a screen used by the manager of vendor A to add an appointment ... the manager has previously set his level of revision access ... and has allowed himself free reign to **make appointments on this calendar**. This is why screen display 240, presented to the manager in making the appointment, limits date to Monday through Friday, and limits times from 9 am to 9 pm. The manager's level of revision access is well-tailored to the employment relationship that he has with employee A" (paragraph [0097]). Or, alternatively, "there are different ways of confirming new appointments or events. FIGS. 8 and 9, show self-reservation situations, wherein the appointment requires no confirmation, but rather is unilaterally made (with prescribed limits) **by the requestor**. However, sometimes it is more appropriate to have the

requestor merely request an appointment (e.g., by email), which then must be conformed by the schedule" (paragraph [0099]). Thus, all appointments in Srimuang are manually scheduled by a requestor. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which recites "automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities."

Srimuang, in paragraph 0080 and 0081, cited in the Office Action, and elsewhere, merely describes a method and system for different groups making use of the same calendar/scheduler belonging to a member of all of the groups. The oil change described in paragraph 0080 is not an automatically scheduled task, as described in the present claimed invention, but rather a manually driven resource scheduler. The customer selects the task they want done, i.e. an oil change, and the system schedules the people and resources necessary to perform the task/oil change. Nowhere in these passages, or elsewhere in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** selection of a task from a plurality of tasks, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there mention or suggestion of "automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 16 of the present invention. This **automatic** task selection and assignment significantly improves hospital personnel and resource allocation, planning and operation and is not suggested by the user driven manual

scheduling or appointment systems of the cited reference. Such scheduling or appointment systems merely schedule tasks or appointments that are selected **by a user** and in contrast to the claimed method, do NOT automatically select tasks from multiple available tasks or select a worker from multiple workers and assign tasks to the selected worker.

Additionally, in Srimuang, when a user wishes to schedule an appointment, the user must **manually** select an available time slot (or, alternatively, a manager manually books an appointment for the user). This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which "automatically assign[s] said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity." Manually assigning an appointment based on an available time slot, as in Srimuang, is not equivalent to the automatic assignment, as in the present claimed invention. Srimuang may list available time slots for an appointment after checking the availability, however, Srimuang is not equivalent to the present claimed invention which recites "automatically assign[ing] said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity."

Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 17

Claim 17 provides a method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules. Display is initiated of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for selectively assigning a task representative identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities. The at least one of the plurality of displayable tasks schedules is associated with a respective one of the corresponding plurality of different entities. The decision information includes data identifying at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning the task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the particular entity, to the particular task schedule. An event triggers application of the at least one executable procedure. Decision information entered via the at least one interface menu is received. Execution of the at least one executable procedure is automatically initiated to select a particular task schedule from the plurality of displayable task schedules. The task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by the respective one of the corresponding plurality of different entities is automatically selectively assigned to the at least one of the plurality of task schedules associated with the corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to occurrence of the triggering event.

Srimuang provides calendaring and scheduling software wherein separate groups are separately administered, especially with respect to access rules and the related ability to self-reserve appointments (See Abstract). Srimuang deals with the extra time and effort involved with multiple calendars being consulted and maintained separately by

grouping parties into groups for the purposes of view access and/or revision access to a computer-based calendar (see Srimuang paragraph [0008] and paragraph [0009]).

Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "initiating display of at least one interface menu ... automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select a particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and to automatically selectively assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said respective one of said corresponding plurality of different entities, to said at least one of the plurality of task schedules associated with said corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to occurrence of the triggering event" as recited in claim 17 of the present invention.

Although Srimuang describes a scheduling system, the scheduling is performed by **a user**. Fig. 8 of Srimuang "shows a screen used by the manager of vendor A to add an appointment ... the manager has previously set his level of revision access ... and has allowed himself free reign to **make appointments on this calendar**. This is why screen display 240, presented to the manager in making the appointment, limits date to Monday through Friday, and limits times from 9 am to 9 pm. The manager's level of revision access is well-tailored to the employment relationship that he has with employee A" (paragraph [0097]). Or, alternatively, "there are different ways of confirming new appointments or events. FIGS. 8 and 9, show self-reservation situations, wherein the appointment requires no confirmation, but rather is unilaterally made (with prescribed limits) **by the requestor**. However, sometimes it is more appropriate to have the

requestor merely request an appointment (e.g., by email), which then must be conformed by the schedule" (paragraph [0099]). Thus, all appointments in Srimuang are manually scheduled by a requestor. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which recites "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select a particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules."

Srimuang, in paragraph 0080 and 0081, cited in the Office Action, and elsewhere, merely describes a method and system for different groups making use of the same calendar/scheduler belonging to a member of all of the groups. The oil change described in paragraph 0080 is not an automatically scheduled task, as described in the present claimed invention, but rather a manually driven resource scheduler. The customer selects the task they want done, i.e. an oil change, and the system schedules the people and resources necessary to perform the task/oil change. Nowhere in these passages, or elsewhere in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** execution of an executable procedure to select a particular task schedule from a plurality of displayable task schedules, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there mention or suggestion of "automatically selectively assign[ing] said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said respective one of said corresponding plurality of different entities, to said at least one of the plurality of task schedules associated with said corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to occurrence of the triggering event" as recited in claim 17 of the present invention. This **automatic** task selection and assignment significantly improves hospital personnel and resource allocation, planning

and operation and is not suggested by the user driven manual scheduling or appointment systems of the cited reference. Such scheduling or appointment systems merely schedule tasks or appointments that are selected **by a user** and in contrast to the claimed method, do NOT automatically select tasks from multiple available tasks or select a worker from multiple workers and assign tasks to the selected worker. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 18

Claim 18 provides a system for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules. A display processor initiates display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks. An identifier representing a selected task is assigned to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event. The particular task schedule is associated with a particular entity of the corresponding plurality of different entities. An interface processor receives decision information entered via the at least one interface menu and automatically initiates execution of the at least one executable procedure, in response to received information identifying occurrence of an event. A task is automatically selected from a plurality of different tasks. A task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by the particular entity is automatically assigned to the task schedule associated with the particular entity.

Srimuang provides calendaring and scheduling software wherein separate groups are separately administered, especially with respect to access rules and the related ability to self-reserve appointments (See Abstract). Srimuang deals with the extra time and effort involved with multiple calendars being consulted and maintained separately by grouping parties into groups for the purposes of view access and/or revision access to a computer-based calendar (see Srimuang paragraph [0008] and paragraph [0009]).

Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 18 of the present invention.

Although Srimuang describes a scheduling system, the scheduling is performed by **a user**. Fig. 8 of Srimuang "shows a screen used by the manager of vendor A to add an appointment ... the manager has previously set his level of revision access ... and has allowed himself free reign to **make appointments on this calendar**. This is why screen display 240, presented to the manager in making the appointment, limits date to Monday through Friday, and limits times from 9 am to 9 pm. The manager's level of revision access is well-tailored to the employment relationship that he has with employee A" (paragraph [0097]). Or, alternatively, "there are different ways of confirming new appointments or events. FIGS. 8 and 9, show self-reservation situations, wherein the

appointment requires no confirmation, but rather is unilaterally made (with prescribed limits) **by the requestor**. However, sometimes it is more appropriate to have the requestor merely request an appointment (e.g., by email), which then must be conformed by the schedule" (paragraph [0099]). Thus, all appointments in Srimuang are manually scheduled by a requestor. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which recites "automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities."

Srimuang, in paragraph 0080 and 0081, cited in the Office Action, and elsewhere, merely describes a method and system for different groups making use of the same calendar/scheduler belonging to a member of all of the groups. The oil change described in paragraph 0080 is not an automatically scheduled task, as described in the present claimed invention, but rather a manually driven resource scheduler. The customer selects the task they want done, i.e. an oil change, and the system schedules the people and resources necessary to perform the task/oil change. Nowhere in these passages, or elsewhere in Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the **automatic** selection of a task from a plurality of tasks, as in the present claimed invention. Applicant further respectfully submits that nowhere in these passages is there mention or suggestion of "automatically selecting ... and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" as recited in claim 18 of the present invention. This **automatic** task selection and assignment

significantly improves hospital personnel and resource allocation, planning and operation and is not suggested by the user driven manual scheduling or appointment systems of the cited reference. Such scheduling or appointment systems merely schedule tasks or appointments that are selected **by a user** and in contrast to the claimed method, do NOT automatically select tasks from multiple available tasks or select a worker from multiple workers and assign tasks to the selected worker. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure in Srimuang that anticipates the present claimed invention. Thus, in view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 and 14-19 not anticipated by Srimuang. It is thus further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 12 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srimuang (U.S. 2003/0061087) in view of Mayhak, Jr. et al. (U.S. 2001/0051888).

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, it is incumbent upon the examiner to establish a factual basis to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed.Cir. 1988). In so doing, the Examiner is expected to make the factual determinations set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (CCPA 1966), and to provide a reason why one having ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have been led to modify the prior art or to combine prior art

references to arrive at the claimed invention. Such reason must stem from some teaching, suggestion, or implication in the prior art as a whole or knowledge generally available to one having ordinary skill in the art. *Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 837 F.2d 1044, 1051, 5 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 488 U.S. 825 (1988); *Ashland Oil Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 28, 293, 227 USPQ 657, 664 (Fed.Cir. 1985), *cert. denied,* 475 U.S. 1017 (1986); *ACS Hosp. Sys., Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp.*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed.Cir. 1984). These showings by the Examiner are an essential part of complying with the burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed.Cir. 1992).

CLAIM 12

Claim 12 is dependent on claim 8 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 8. Srimuang and Mayhak, when taken alone or combination, neither disclose nor suggest the feature claimed in claim 12. Specifically, Mayhak (with Srimuang) fails to disclose or suggest that "said at least one executable procedure conditions allocation of the task to the task schedule associated with the particular entity upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences" and "further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences" as recited in claim 12 of the present invention. Moreover, Srimuang (with Mayhak) neither discloses nor suggests "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said

particular entity, to said selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event" as recited in the present claimed invention. Mayhak adds nothing to Srimuang that would disclose or suggests the features of the present invention.

As stated on page 9 of the Office Action, Srimuang "does not ... disclose that the tasks are allocated based upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences, that the triggering event is conditioned upon coincident of a plurality of occurrences, or acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences." Applicant respectfully submits that Mayhak, Jr. (with Srimuang) neither discloses nor suggests this feature combination. Rather, the Mayhak paragraphs 0010-0012, 0040-0042, 0065, 0068, 0071 and 0076, cited in the Office Action, merely concern a user driven scheduling system. As described above, the present invention automatically assigns a task based on received information identifying the occurrence of a triggering event. Claim 12 further defines the selection of a task being based "upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences and...data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences." Nowhere in Mayhak or Srimuang is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing "assigning" tasks "in response to occurrence of the triggering event' and specifically in response to "coincidence of a plurality of occurrences." The reference also fails to show or suggest "acquiring data to **identify the coincidence** of the plurality of occurrences." The cited reference passages simply do not show or suggest such features and the Rejection fails to make any showing that specifically identifies where such a combination of features are present.

Applicant further respectfully submits that even if there was reason or motivation

to combine these two references, the combination of the method of Srimuang with the method of Mayhak, Jr. as suggested in the rejection would not result in the present claimed invention. This combination would result in a method where a user enters patient information and the system checks a single calendar maintained of a member of a group to schedule various patients and the appropriate employees for the same day. The combination of Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr. neither disclose nor suggest "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event" as recited in the present claimed invention. Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr. also neither disclose nor suggest "a. said at least one executable procedure conditions allocation of the task to the task schedule associated with the particular entity upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences, and b. further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences" recited in claim 12 of the present invention. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 13

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 8 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 8. Srimuang neither discloses nor suggests the feature combination of "a. the triggering event is conditioned upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences, and b. further including acquiring data to identify the

coincidence of the plurality of occurrences" as recited in claim 13 of the present invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Mayhak, Jr. (with Srimuang) also neither discloses nor suggests this feature combination. Rather, the Mayhak paragraphs 0010-002, 0036, 0040-0042, 0065, 0067-0068 and 0076 relied on, as well as paragraphs 0071 and 0081, cited in the Office Action, merely concern a user driven scheduling system. As described above with respect to claim 8, the present invention automatically assigns a task based on received information identifying the occurrence of a triggering event. Claim 13 further defines the triggering event being based "upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences and...data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences." Nowhere in Mayhak or Srimuang, when taken alone or in combination, is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing "assigning" tasks "in response to occurrence of the triggering event' and specifically in response to "coincidence of a plurality of occurrences." The reference also fails to show or suggest "acquiring data to **identify the coincidence** of the plurality of occurrences." The cited reference passages simply do not show or suggest such features and the Rejection fails to make any showing that specifically identifies where such a combination of features are present. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-19 should be reversed. In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in combination, provide no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that makes dependent claims 1-19 unpatentable. Therefore,

Applicant further respectfully submits that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

The "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action states that "Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references." Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments over cited references Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr. specifically show that Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the features claimed in claims 12 and 13. Additionally, claims 12 and 13 are dependent on independent claim 8 and are also patentable because Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments against claims 12 and 13 are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.111(b) and thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in combination, provide no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that makes claims 1-19 unpatentable. Therefore, Applicant further respectfully submits that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in any combination, neither disclose nor suggest automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks as in the present claimed invention. Specifically, Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., when taken alone or in any combination also neither disclose nor suggest assigning a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by a particular entity as in the present claimed invention. Additionally, Srimuang and Mayhak, Jr., neither disclose nor suggest automatically initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to select a selected task schedule from a plurality of displayable task schedules and assign the task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by a particular entity as in the present claimed invention. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 – 19 be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,
Siemens Medical Solutions Health Services Corporation

Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Date: June 19, 2007

Alexander J. Burke
Intellection Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
Customer No. 28524
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030

APPENDIX I – APPEALED CLAIMS

1. (Previously Presented) A method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules, comprising the activities of:

a. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities;

b. receiving decision information entered via said at least one interface menu; and

c. applying the received decision information and initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure, in response to received information identifying an event, to automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity.

2. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1, including the activity of

initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to automatically select said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to said received information identifying an event and wherein

the step of initiating display of the at least one interface menu includes initiating display of menu elements prompting a user to identify at least one of (a) the predetermined event triggering application of the decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule, (b) a source of the decision information, (c) decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for identifying a task schedule for listing the task representative identifier.

3. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein

the decision information initiates execution of at least one logical procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier.

4. (Original) A method according to claim 3, wherein

the data associated with a task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled procedure, (b) a time and date of performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type identifier and (f) patient physical characteristics.

5. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1, wherein

said decision information initiates execution of said at least one executable procedure to automatically and programmatically without user intervention select said task and assign said identifier, in response to received information identifying an event and

the entity comprises at least one of (a) a category of users, (b) one or more users currently designated to perform a healthcare worker role and (c) a medical device or system.

6. (Original) A method according to claim 1, wherein:

a. the decision information identifies the predetermined event and

b. the predetermined event corresponds to at least one of (a) patient admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure and (d) a user defined event based on information acquired.

7. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1,

wherein said received decision information initiates execution of said at least one executable procedure to prioritize a plurality of task representative identifiers of a task schedule associated with a particular entity in response to

occurrence of a triggering event.

8. (Previously Presented) A method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules, comprising the activities of:

a. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a selected task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, said selected task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities and accessible by the particular entity, the decision information including data identifying:

i. at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to select a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, and

ii. an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure;

b. receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu;

and

c. automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event.

9. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 8, wherein

said at least one interface menu supports user entry of decision information including said data identifying said at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to said selected task schedule of said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to received information

identifying an event and

the data associated with a task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled procedure, (b) a time and date of performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type identifier and (f) patient physical characteristics.

10. (Original) A method according to claim 8, wherein

the triggering event corresponds to at least one of (a) patient admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure and (d) a user defined event based on acquired information.

11. (Original) A method according to claim 8 further including acquiring the data associated with a task.

12. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 8, wherein

a. said at least one executable procedure conditions allocation of the task to the task schedule associated with the particular entity upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences, and

b. further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences.

13. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 8, wherein

a. the triggering event is conditioned upon coincidence of a plurality of occurrences, and

b. further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences.

14. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 8,

wherein said at least one executable procedure removes a task representative identifier from the task schedule associated with the particular entity in

response to occurrence of a triggering event.

15. (Previously Presented) A method for providing a user interface for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules comprising the activities of:

a. in response to a user command,

i. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities; and

ii. initiating display of an updated task schedule including said selected task having said assigned identifier associated with the particular entity, in response to received information identifying an event.

16. (Previously Presented) A method for providing a user interface supporting assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules comprising the activities of:

a. in response to a user command,

i. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being accessible by the particular entity, the decision information including data identifying,

ii. at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative

identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said particular task schedule, and

iii. an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure; and

b. initiating display of an updated task schedule associated with the particular entity, the updated task schedule being generated in response to received information identifying a triggering event initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to automatically assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity.

17. (Previously Presented) A method for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules comprising the activities of:

a. initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for selectively assigning a task representative identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, said at least one of a said plurality of displayable task schedules being associated with a respective one of said corresponding plurality of different entities, the decision information including data identifying:

i. at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said particular task schedule, and

ii. an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure;

b. receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu; and

c. automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select a particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task

schedules

and to automatically selectively assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said respective one of said corresponding plurality of different entities, to said at least one of the plurality of task schedules associated with said corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to occurrence of the triggering event.

18. (Previously Presented) A system for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules comprising:

a. a display processor for initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities; and

b. an interface processor for receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu and for automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure, in response to received information identifying occurrence of an event to automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks and automatically assign a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity.

19. (Original) A computer program embodied within a computer-readable medium created using the method of claim 1.

APPENDIX II - EVIDENCE

Applicant does not rely on any additional evidence other than the arguments submitted hereinabove.

APPENDIX III - RELATED PROCEEDINGS

Applicant respectfully submits that there are no proceedings related to this appeal in which any decisions were rendered.

APPENDIX IV - TABLE OF CASES

1. *In re Howard*, 394 F. 2d 869, 157 USPQ 615, 616 (CCPA 1968)
2. 29 AM. Jur 2D Evidence S. 33 (1994)
3. *In re Ahlert*, 424 F. 2d 1088, 1091, 165 USPQ 418, 420 (CCPA 1970)
4. *In re Eynde*, 480 F. 2d 1364, 1370; 178 USPQ 470, 474 (CCPA 1973)
5. *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ 2d 1600, (Fed Cir. 1988)
6. ACS Hospital Systems Inc v. Montefiore Hospital, 221 USPQ 929,933 (Fed. Cir. 1984)
7. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (CCPA 1966)
8. *Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 837 F.2d 1044, 1051, 5 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 488 U.S. 825 (1988)
9. *Ashland Oil Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 28, 293, 227 USPQ 657, 664 (Fed.Cir. 1985), *cert. denied,* 475 U.S. 1017 (1986)
10. *In re Oetiker,* 977 F2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992)

APPENDIX V - LIST OF REFERENCES

U.S. Pub. No.	Issued Date	102(e) Date	Inventors
2003/0061087	03-2003		Srimuang
2001/0051888	12-2001		Mayhak, Jr. et al.

TABLE OF CONTENTS